

or whether children will continue to be separated from their parents while the facilities to hold them are located or built.

We have so much work to do, because even in ending the heinous practice of separating families, there are still many legal and practical obstacles.

Kenneth Wolfe, a spokesman for the Administration for Children and Families, a division of the Department of Health and Human Services, initially stated that “there will not be a grandfathering of existing cases.”

Mr. Wolfe was later to be corrected by Brian Marriott, Senior Director of Communications for the Department of Health and Human Services, who stated that Mr. Wolfe had “misspoke” and insisted that “it is still very early, and we are awaiting further guidance on the matter.”

Mr. Marriott then said that “reunification is always the goal” and that the agency “is working toward that” for the children separated from their families because of President Trump’s policy.

While there is a possibility that the children could be connected with other family members or sponsors living in the United States, it is not necessarily the parent they were separated from at the border.

This raises the heart-breaking questions of what happens to the more than 2,300 children who have already been separated from their parents under the president’s “zero tolerance” policy?

We have all heard the wailing of detained immigrant children on audio tapes and we have all seen the heartbreaking pictures.

The latest reports suggest that very young infants, some as young as 3 months old, are being separated and being placed in “tender age shelters.”

This is outrageous.

This past weekend, I was at a processing center in McAllen, Texas and the Southwest Key Programs’ Casa Padre which houses 1,500 children, most of them separated from their parents.

I saw people huddled in cages.

I saw children who certainly needed to be with their parents.

Like nine-month old baby Roger, who I held in my arms.

Or Leah, a one year old, separated from her grandmother and her sister, whose love for her would have provided comfort and protection.

As the Founder and Chair of the Congressional Children’s Caucus and as a parent and grandparent, this is unacceptable.

Studies have documented that when young children are forcibly removed from their parents, the traumatic experience engenders long-term negative effects on their physical and mental health and well-being suffers.

In one famous experiment in Romania, doctors considered the results later in life of those children separated from their parents.

The activity in the children’s brains was much lower than expected.

“If you think of the brain as a lightbulb,” Charles Nelson, a pediatrics professor at Harvard Medical School said, “it’s as though there was a dimmer that had reduced them from a 100-watt bulb to 30 watts.”

The children, who had been separated from their parents in their first two years of life, scored significantly lower on IQ tests later in life.

Their fight-or-flight response system appeared permanently broken.

Stressful situations that would usually prompt physiological responses in other people—increased heart rate, sweaty palms—would provoke nothing in the children.

The effects of these traumatic experiences—especially in children who have already faced serious adversity—are unlikely to be short-lived, and can likely last a lifetime.

The stressed endured by a child in custody is exacerbated when the child does not speak a language that is not English or Spanish.

Although the government has a legal obligation to provide reasonable language services to unaccompanied minors, many children arriving to the U.S. speak indigenous languages and have little or no translation assistance provided by the U.S. government.

The last time this nation had policies that promoted the forcible separation of children from newly arrived persons was slavery: a dark chapter in this nation’s history that we should not revisit.

Today, the parents of these thousands of children will not be deterred from finding ways to reunite with their children, even reentering the United States under the threat of imprisonment.

It would be unconscionable to prosecute parents under these circumstances.

The level of callousness displayed by this administration towards those seeking refuge within our borders is shocking and the world is taking note.

Yesterday, Theresa May, the Prime Minister of our closest ally Great Britain, denounced the “zero-tolerance” policy on the floor of the House of Commons.

His Holiness Pope Francis said the “zero-tolerance” policy is contrary to Catholic values.

The Most Reverend Bishop Michael Curry stated that for Christians, Jesus of Nazareth is the standard of conduct for your life—he tells us—“love God and love thy neighbor.”

However, the Trump Administration has forgotten that.

The United States Secretary of Homeland Security Kirstjen Nielsen defended this egregious policy.

Attorney General Jeff Sessions used Romans 13 (submit to rulers) to justify the “zero-tolerance” policy.

It is outrageous to use the Bible—Romans 13—to justify this policy.

However, many used Romans 13 to justify horrors in history such as slavery and Nazism.

The more operative biblical passages should be, Matthew 7—the golden rule—or Matthew 25—I was a stranger and you welcomed me (“least of these”).

National policy regarding immigration legislation should not create greater fear for families already traumatized by intolerable conditions in their home countries.

U.S. immigration policy should not deter refugees from seeking asylum within our borders.

I am thankful to the 60 members of the United States Senate of Congress who said enough is enough to the despicable “zero-tolerance” policy.

I am thankful to the Republican governors of Maryland and Massachusetts who ended their contribution of National Guard deployments because they too are saying “not in my name.”

But there is still more work to be done.

We should welcome mothers carrying their babies to a safe haven and ensure the safety of their children.

The Trump administration is utterly failing in its basic duty to treat all persons with dignity and compassion.

Rather, it is making a mockery of our national values and reputation as a champion of human rights.

We are a great country with a long and noble tradition of providing sanctuary to the persecuted and oppressed.

And it is in that spirit that we should act.

We can do it; after all, we are Americans.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GALLAGHER). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be recognized here on the floor of the House of Representatives and take up a topic that I have been hearing about here for some time.

It seems as though the Nation is wrapped up in an immigration discussion again. We seem to peak out on our peak concern of immigration issues a couple of times a decade, and a lot of the same topics are debated over and over again.

I have been listening to the minority here for some time, a full hour, I believe, and a number of things come to mind that don’t seem to match up the same from my perspective as theirs, and one of them is, you know, the discussion about separating families.

I have made multiple, multiple trips down to the border. I have traveled most of the miles of the border. I can’t say definitively that I have traveled them all—I don’t know if anyone has—but I have flown a lot of it, driven a lot of it, walked a fair amount of it, ridden with the Border Patrol sometimes for days on end, and sat down at night and listened in the darkness at some of the most dangerous crossings there are as illegal aliens come through the fence and over the border.

I have been there as part of the arrests of the drug smuggling that comes through our border. I have seen MS-13 be among those that we arrested for smuggling drugs into the United States of America.

I have watched as we paroled into the United States, I will say, the casualties from the bar fights on the Mexican side of the border and the knifings that have taken place there, and I have visited some of those folks in the hospital.

I have met and discussed with the hospital officials the cost to them for funding the medical care for people who are not only not Americans, they are not American citizens. They are not American green card holders. They aren’t even illegal aliens in America. They are paroled into America for medical care out of the compassion and the sympathy of our hearts.

So to hear the discussion about how cruel we are, how mean we are, how

heartless we are, some of these phrases—I wrote a couple of them down, Mr. Speaker. Apparently, I did so on a different piece of paper.

However, here is one, “tore his daughter out of his arms,” speaking of a father and a daughter. We just heard that a little bit ago, Mr. Speaker.

“Tore his daughter out of his arms”; “babies separated from their parents, some at 8 months, some at 11 months”; “it is a disaster”; “it is cruel”; it is dangerous”; “this is child abuse”—these are the things that I am listening to.

Well, I took the trouble to go and to visit those locations, and I am thinking in particular of McAllen, Texas, in the Brownsville area, where we have multiple locations of transfer homes for these children. Most of them are unaccompanied alien children who have come into America on their own, and they are older than they are described to be, and some of them are older than they say they are.

In fact, I see some of these juveniles in the juvenile cell at the Border Patrol, and those folks that are under 18, presumably, with a little gray in their beard. That is a little bit of a giveaway. You would think that they might at least shave so that doesn't show up. But they are not the way they are characterized to be.

As I stand on the border and go into these locations, the first one, I think, of focus and attention would be going into the locations where the unaccompanied alien children are housed. One of the first locations that they set up when the largest flood came into the United States about 3 years ago was a huge warehouse in McAllen, Texas.

In that huge warehouse, they moved in there and they went to work. In a matter of 17 days, Mr. Speaker, they cleaned everything out of that warehouse, squared it away, washed it down, scrubbed it down, wired it, and put in a full air-conditioning system along with chain link barriers in there that set it off in kind of like partitions for large rooms.

You have to do that, because when you have several hundred or even several thousand youth that you have to take care of, you can't leave the boys and the girls together. You have got to separate them to a degree by age, and they did that.

So they had them managed in that fashion, the younger boys in this area, little bit older boys in this area, the more older boys in this area, and the same with the girls; keep the boys and the girls separated except for certain activities such as the outdoor recreation that they had.

So people say, well, that is cruel, because they saw—this all got started because we saw a picture on the internet of a little boy standing behind a chain link fence, and it was advertised that that little boy, Mr. Speaker, was in a cage, that we had been putting these unaccompanied alien children in cages. Well, no. It was a huge warehouse, an air-conditioned warehouse.

You can stand any child in a schoolyard—that is the same kind of fence that is in the schools all over America, all over the world so far as I know, chain link fencing. You could stand a little boy or a little girl behind that chain link fencing in the corner and take a picture of them and contend that they were in a cage.

It is not a cage. It was a large divided area. And some of those areas were large enough that they were playing soccer in them.

So when these kids come in, they get a shower. They get cleaned up. They get medical care. They get a medical examination to see if they are carrying any disease, if they have any injuries, if they need any medical treatment of any kind, and they will square them away with any medical treatment that they need. They get a fresh change of clothes.

When they go in, they get three squares a day. They get a mattress to sleep on that is about three or four times more comfortable than a sleeping bag. It is not a fancy four-poster bed, but it is a warm, comfortable place to sleep. They get their own blankets, their own coverage that way. And they are managed all the time. They have the things that they need.

Somebody said to me: Well, but they only get 2 hours of fresh air a day.

This is hot. It is hot. It is in Texas. It is hot in south Texas. They are playing soccer indoors in air-conditioning.

My kids didn't ever get to do that. My grandkids don't get to do that. I never got to do that. But that is what is going on down there.

They are not abused and they are not short of the things that they need to be taken care of. And, yes, there are counselors there to talk with them.

And by the way, the most recent trip was last October. It was a bipartisan trip. I have heard one of the Members who was on that trip from the other party complaining about how badly we were treating these kids, but it wasn't her concern when we were down there asking questions of the people who were taking care of them.

That Member did ask a lot of questions, was concerned about their care, but not alarmed because these children didn't have their mother or their father with them. That wasn't an issue that was raised at all.

So all of a sudden it becomes the subject du jour that they “tore his daughter out of his arms.” Well, there is a way to characterize that, isn't it? I don't think that actually fits at all. I think if you had the video, you couldn't characterize it that way.

But here is what does tear a baby from its mother, and it is called abortion. If you want to really see, Mr. Speaker, how bad that is—nobody has got a video of what goes on in the abortion mill because it is too ghastly. But if a baby is ever torn from its mother, it is through abortion, and it doesn't seem to bother the folks on the other side of the aisle. They will rail away

for days on end about 2,000 juveniles who were separated from their parents because—well, usually a parent, because the parent committed a crime.

I would submit there are more American citizens who are separated from their children because those American citizens committed crime on a daily basis than there are illegal alien mothers or fathers who are separated from their illegal alien children, because when they commit a crime, that is what happens.

So we have tens of thousands of American citizens in prison today who are separated from their sons and daughters. Usually it is the dads, not as often the moms, but that doesn't seem to bother the left either, how many of these criminal American citizens are separated, but it does bother them, apparently, because there is political hay to be made over making a big issue out of this.

The people taking care of these children down here are compassionate. They are giving gentle, loving care. We are hiring coaches to play soccer with them in the air-conditioned building, and yet they are being characterized as a cage.

Well, what shall I say? One of the largest warehouses I have seen anywhere is not a cage, but they do have dividers in there that are made out of chain link, the same thing that is used in the playgrounds, the fences around the playgrounds, Mr. Speaker.

So I think there is a lot of hyperventilation going on here and very little substance, but the President addressed this with an executive order.

And by the way, I support the policy change that he brought forth with his executive order, but it is not enough to satisfy the left. They will never be satisfied.

I have long said that if I had a magic wand—let's see if I have got one here in my pocket, a magic wand—and I would say to the left, “You have got all the rest of the year to come up with a list of all of the things that you want and you can write these policy changes down and agree on them; and I don't care how long that list is, it can be infinity minus one, all of the things you have, and when the ball drops at Times Square in New York for the new year, I will wave the magic wand and you can have all the policy changes that you plotted up from today till December 31 at midnight,” and if we made that deal and I agreed to all of that and this wand actually were magic, and when the ball dropped at Times Square and the new year started, I would say, “Presto, here you go; now you have got all the things you want. We have solved all of the problems”—well, that would probably include the impeachment of Donald Trump, so I would exempt that one from the list, Mr. Speaker, but all the rest of them, here is what would happen: They would stay up all night the rest of the night whining about being cheated because we didn't give them enough time to come

up with the things they wanted to do to our country, and they would never be satisfied.

And if I required that they had to show us what they wanted America to look like once they had their globalist utopia established, they wouldn't be able to paint it, because they can't see into the future. All they want to do is tear down what is and continue to tear down what is rather than build up what is best for us. That means they are turning their back on the foundations laid down by our Founding Fathers, turning their back on constitutional issues, Mr. Speaker, turning their back and denying the very human nature components of this.

And, you know, when I see that Bill Clinton, Hillary Clinton, Harry Reid, CHUCK SCHUMER, all of them have spoken for at least a measure of border security, build a wall, we can't be a sovereign nation if we don't secure our borders, all of those folks have spoken in that way 20 years ago, but not anymore—not anymore because they have decided, as a party, that they have an advantage for pouring illegal aliens into the United States of America because it picks up for them.

These illegal aliens are counted in the Census. If you noticed the hyperventilation, Mr. Speaker, that came out when the administration announced that they were going to count citizens separately in the Census, and, oh, my gosh, you would have thought that the world had come to an end as far as the Democrats were concerned, Mr. Speaker, because they are afraid that it will suppress the count of human beings. They believe that illegal aliens deserve to be represented in the United States Congress.

And by the way, they are, they are represented in the United States Congress. We have now held a couple of hearings on this. I held a hearing in the Constitution Committee that I chair just a few weeks ago. But I recall testimony from about 10 or 12 years ago that came from Steve Camarata, Dr. Steve Camarata of the Center for Immigration Studies, who testified that if we counted citizens for redistricting purposes rather than people, so then people would include legal and illegal immigrants, but noncitizens, if we only counted citizens and redistricted accordingly, then what we would have would be somewhere between 8 and 11—this is his old testimony—8 and 11 congressional districts that would move out of States like Florida, Texas, and California into States like Utah, Iowa would pick a seat back up again, and Indiana. Those States come to mind in that fashion.

□ 2045

But as it is, illegal aliens are counted alongside citizens. The congressional seats here are different because we are not counting citizens for reapportionment purposes; we are counting all people.

So why is it that they want to invite illegals into their cities like Los Ange-

les, like maybe MAXINE WATERS' district? Why do they want to protect them? It gives them political power. And it takes me a lot more votes to be elected or reelected in my district, because I have a low percentage of illegal aliens. And it takes a lot fewer votes if you are in a district with a high percentage, presuming that the illegal aliens are not voting. And they are voting in increasing numbers, and that has been proven, too.

So we have people that have a political gain that comes out of promoting illegal immigration. We are hearing it come out of the mouths of the people on the left time after time after time, to make a political issue out of this.

The most successful institutions over the last two centuries, Mr. Speaker, are the nation-states, the nation-states. You have to be a sovereign nation-state, and that requires a border. You have to control who comes and who goes outside of that border or inside of that border. That is what nations do.

And inside the nation-state, you have to have the rule of law. That law also covers who comes and who goes. Our Founding Fathers understood this. They wrote it into our Constitution. And they established that the Congress establishes immigration policy, because they knew they were establishing a nation-state.

The nation-states had not been established for that long or that successfully in the time that our Founding Fathers laid down the foundation for America, but they had the vision on how best to build a country. They wrote some of it in the Declaration and the rest of it in the Constitution.

Here we are, well past two centuries of terrific success, the unchallenged greatest Nation in the world. We have created a larger economy, a stronger military, a more powerful culture, more influential around the world than any country has ever seen, and it is built upon the pillars of American exceptionalism. Those pillars are described as Ronald Reagan described often for us: The shining city on the hill.

Mr. Speaker, I can see that shining city on the hill in my mind's eye, painted by President Reagan, whom I revered. But I would argue that really isn't a shining city on the hill. I would rather envision this shining city as a shining city built upon the pillars of American exceptionalism. Those pillars of American exceptionalism, the perimeter pillars around the outside edge with a central pillar in the middle that holds it all together, but around the outside edge would be a pillar for freedom of speech, a pillar for freedom of religion, a pillar for freedom of assembly, a pillar for freedom of the press. That is just the First Amendment. Another pillar for Second Amendment rights, the right to keep and bear arms so that we can protect all of our other rights. And on up the line, a pillar for property rights and

the Fifth Amendment; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation. Another pillar for being tried by a jury of our peers, no double jeopardy, and on around the line.

A few other pillars along the way that aren't in the Bill of Rights, and another one would be free enterprise capitalism as our economic system that has been a foundation for the success of America. And the property rights not only that I have quoted in the Fifth Amendment, but also intellectual property rights, so that creators have a right to the proceeds of their work.

Then, as I define these pillars around the outside, the perimeter pillars in this shining city on the pillars of American exceptionalism, I would add to that, as I said, free enterprise capitalism, the dynamic economy that we have, and Judeo-Christian values that are core in the foundation. They are the founding of our country. They are the core of the moral foundation that we are, as a people. They are part of our religion, and they are part of our culture. This Nation would collapse if we ever lost them. And when they are weakened, America goes wobbly.

But all of these pillars that I have described are perimeter pillars. The central pillar of American exceptionalism, the one that we cannot and dare not sacrifice, is the rule of law. That is the central pillar that sits in the middle that anchors everything else that it sets upon and ties together.

What is happening here in this Congress, this day and these days, is a relentless effort that is eroding this essential pillar of American exceptionalism called the rule of law.

Whenever a Member gets up and argues that we should grant amnesty to illegal aliens because it makes our hearts feel good, what we are doing is desecrating these pillars of American exceptionalism and chiseling away on them and eroding them. Our job needs to be to refurbish the pillars of American exceptionalism, not erode them.

So to go back into some of these topics that are being addressed by people on the other side of the aisle and people on this side of the aisle, they continually say that it is too dangerous in these countries in Central America, so we need to get these young people out of countries like, let's say, Honduras, El Salvador, Venezuela, Colombia, Belize, Guatemala, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, Dominican Republic, Brazil. Get people out of there. Get young people out of there, because it is too dangerous for them. They might be killed by the gangs down there.

I recall sitting in a Judiciary Committee meeting when John Conyers was the ranking member from Detroit, and they were making that argument, that it is too dangerous in Central America for these young people, these, let's say, 13-, 14-, 15-, 16-, 17-year-olds, especially boys, to get them out of there and bring them into America.

Well, where do they put them? Right back into the inner city here, in a center of an ethnic enclave that is full of gangs.

So I said, if you think it is too dangerous for those children in Guatemala, that they should go to America, you had better not take them to Detroit, because it is more dangerous in Detroit than it is in Guatemala. It is more dangerous in Baltimore than it is in Honduras. It is more dangerous sometimes in Washington, D.C. It is more dangerous in New Orleans. It is more dangerous in St. Louis, especially East St. Louis, than it is in any of these countries down here that I have just mentioned.

But, Mr. Speaker, these countries that I mentioned, and I am going to go through it in a little more detail, these are the top 10 most violent countries in the world. There is a website called worldlifeexpectancy.com, and I have followed it for a decade or so.

So these are the most current numbers, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is important for the body to understand what is going on here. We are listening to people advocate for bringing prime gang-age young men, especially, out of these countries into America. They are coming from the most violent countries in the world, some of them going into the most violent cities in America. We know the countryside is safer than the cities, statistically at least.

So here are some numbers. The most violent country in the world right now, the one where you can have a greater expectancy of dying a violent death, is Honduras. Honduras has a 94.47 violent deaths per 100,000 rate, according to worldlifeexpectancy.com. That is Honduras.

Then El Salvador, Number two, the second most violent country in the world: 62.82 violent deaths per 100,000 reported. There have been times when El Salvador was so bad that they didn't give you a number. At least there is a number here. I don't know that I trust it, but we know it is very high.

Venezuela: 50.5 violent deaths per 100,000. That is number 3.

Number 4, it is the only one out of the top 10 that is not south of the Rio Grande, by the way: Zimbabwe, 47.41.

Now we are back to our familiar Western Hemisphere again, south of the Rio Grande: Colombia, 47 violent deaths per 100,000; Belize, 41.54 violent deaths per 100,000; Guatemala, their numbers have been a lot higher. They seem to be a little lower now, but they are still seventh highest in violent death rate in the world: 39.85 violent deaths per 100,000.

Then: Jamaica, 34.79; Trinidad and Tobago, 31.74; and number 10, Dominican Republic comes in at 31.18 violent deaths per 100,000.

Now you think, okay, what does this mean proportionally?

A few more along the way that I have here. That is Dominican Republic. Then Brazil, 29.50.

So what this tells you is nine of the top 10 most violent countries in the

world are south of the Rio Grande River, and 10 of the top 11 most violent countries in the world are south of the Rio Grande.

But one of them is not Mexico. Mexico doesn't come up on this until you get to number 19, and it is easy to remember. Mexico is the 19th most violent country in the world, and they have 19 violent deaths per 100,000.

So if we wanted to enhance violence in America, if we wanted more violence instead of less, one of the things that you would do is you could go look at the most violent countries in the world, try to pick the most violent demographics out of there, young men, and bring them into America if you wanted to ensure that there would be more crime in America.

That is an irrefutable equation. If you go to Honduras and you load up several thousand young men that are 15-, 16-, 17-, 18-, 19-, and 20-years-old, and you bring them in and you drop them into the inner city in Detroit or Baltimore or East St. Louis or Los Angeles, I mean, what do you expect is going to happen, Mr. Speaker? Are there going to be more murders there, or are there going to be less?

I don't think it is any question at all. There will be more murders because of this. There will be more rapes. There will be more assaults. There will be more thefts. There will be more violent crime of all kinds. There will be more drugs dealt.

By the way, some of them, in fact a lot of them, become or are already MS-13. And MS-13, are they sending people into America to expand their drug reach? We know, Mr. Speaker, that they are doing that. And why? Well, they are perpetrating violence. They are shaking down the neighborhoods. They are extracting the mordida payments out of the people around them and threatening the people around them. We know this.

They are killing Americans. I met with some of the families out of New York. One in particular had their daughter killed, just clubbed to death. One had been killed with a machete. And this is MS-13.

But the drug gangs in this country—we had the Director of the Drug Enforcement Agency, Mr. Patterson, before the Judiciary Committee here about a month ago, as I recall, and I asked him a few questions, Mr. Speaker, and it was like this:

What percentage of the illegal drugs consumed in America come from or through Mexico? The answer that he agreed to was 80 to 90 percent of the illegal drugs consumed in America come from or through Mexico.

They are not all produced in Mexico. Some of those drugs, a lot of them, are smuggled out of China. Then they process the drugs there, and they smuggle them into the United States, because that is the most expeditious route.

Now, it is our responsibility, here in the United States, because we have the demand for illegal drugs. But that is

part of it. We need to address it here on the demand side, but we also have to address it on the interdiction side, and we need to address it with regard to Mexico and points south that are part of this equation that is producing and pushing these drugs up into America, particularly fentanyl, the highly, highly dangerous drug that coming in contact with that one time can kill you, and a very small dose of it can do that.

But we have a tremendous number of people coming out of the most violent countries in the world being brought into America, and we are being told we should have sympathy for that. Those are the boys I am talking about.

I counted the numbers down there and looked at the data some time back of the unaccompanied alien children coming into America: 81 percent young males, most of them in that 14- to 16-, 17-year-old age group. But they were 81 percent males then.

If you look at the pictures, riding the Beast, that train of death, you might see 30 or 40 young men there and one or two girls or young women there. But other information that I picked up in traveling around through Central America and down in McAllen and talking to the kids in the transfer centers, I learned this, Mr. Speaker, that it went from seven different sources. These are supervisory sources that were working with these kids.

They insisted that 100 percent of the girls got birth control before they were sent from home on up across into the United States. Say the distance of that is, El Salvador to McAllen, 1,500 miles. McAllen to Minnesota another 1,500 miles, just to put it in proportion.

□ 2100

They would say: No, 100 percent of the girls get birth control pills. They put them on the pill. They give them plan B, the morning after part of it, and they expect that they will be raped. And the consistent message from those same seven different independent sources that didn't index with each other, that 75 percent—75 percent—of the girls who are traveling across Mexico into the United States are raped, 75 percent.

Now, it is a ghastly thought to think that anybody would take their daughter or granddaughter and give them birth control pills and send them on a journey like that believing that somehow they would send them into America, knowing they were going to be raped before they got here as they came across Mexico. That is a piece of this equation that doesn't get stated very often, Mr. Speaker, and that is as close to known facts as we can get. That is field research done by this Member and another Member of Congress, and they are the right kind of witnesses.

So I have described the violence. I have described the drugs. I have described the types of victims that we have, 50,000 of them a month for the last 3 months in America.

That turns out to be 600,000 illegals coming into America that we would be interdicting, not counting those that get past us that we don't see; 600,000 will be the target number, I guess I will say, the predicted number for the calendar year of 2018.

In addition to this, as we talked about, Mr. Speaker, ripping children from their father's arms or from their mother's arms, and I said what really does that is abortion, ripping a child from her mother in that fashion.

We bring into this country between 1 and 1.2 million legal immigrants each year. Let's just round that to a million, Mr. Speaker, a simple number. Well, that happens to be identical to the number of abortions in America each year: 1 million.

So, since 1973 and *Roe v. Wade*, there have been 60 million babies aborted in this country, and about the same number of legal immigrants that have come into America.

It just came into my head a couple days ago as I was listening to someone speak, Mr. Speaker, that, for every time a legal immigrant comes into America, we abort an American baby here. And that baby goes, I guess I could say as gently, into the disposal at Planned Parenthood. That baby is destroyed for every individual that comes into America legally.

And 600,000 illegals coming into America that we have to adjudicate, and who knows how many come in that we aren't catching, that we are not adjudicating.

These American babies, these 60 million American babies are a hole in the demographics of America, and they are a heavy weight on the guilty conscience of a country—60 million babies.

And when you do the back-of-the-envelope calculation to find out what about those future mothers who were aborted, what about those future fathers who were aborted, what would they have done? How many children would they have had starting in 1973?

I did that calculation, and it is only an estimate, and I wouldn't say that there isn't a better way to come up with it, but what I came to was another number. These 60 million babies that have been aborted, roughly 30 million of them are girls. And of those 30 million girls, some of them would have had babies by now.

As you do the calculation on what the birth rate was then for those earlier years, you are looking at perhaps as many as another 60 million babies would have been born, except their mothers and presumably their fathers were aborted, too.

So someplace 60 million aborted, 60 million babies not born because their mothers were aborted. Somewhere around 100 million to 120 million Americans are missing as a result of abortion.

And we are wrapped around the axle because of 2,000 children who were temporarily separated from their parents because their parents committed the

crime, at least the crime of unlawful entry into the United States of America, if not other crimes like document fraud and whatnot.

But all of the criminals who are put into prison who are American citizens are separated from their children, and I am listening to the angst over here that I think is unnecessary hyperventilation, Mr. Speaker.

I think of a mother who was separated from her daughter and how I came to learn that. About, roughly, a decade ago, a little more than a decade ago, I guess, I went over to Iraq to visit our troops over there, and I flew into Kuwait City, the airstrip there.

I was met by a young National Guard captain. It was the middle of the night, about 1, 1:30 in the morning, and she met me and escorted me over to Camp Arifjan, which was where the 1168th Transportation Unit was based as they were hauling equipment and manpower into Baghdad over land from there, a fairly dangerous run.

As the captain took me to visit the troops—and I spoke to a good-size group of the troops. But then afterwards, she had six of her troops who had personal issues that they couldn't solve while they were deployed in Iraq, and I sat down with each of those troops individually, took notes, and put together a bit of a plan of action of what I could do to try to help.

I did follow through and did what I could do. I think I helped some of them. I don't know that I solved it all. She said I did, but I didn't think so, Mr. Speaker.

In any case, I learned this young captain had a 4-year-old daughter who was home, and this young captain was separated from her daughter at the age of 4. So I promised, since the girl was being taken care of by her father and the message was that things were okay at home, I promised I would go check on her daughter because sometimes that Mr. Mom stuff doesn't get confessed over the email when Mom is deployed in the war zone.

So when I got back to the States, I traveled back to Iowa and set up an appointment and went down to visit that home. And there is this little 4-year-old girl, and she had long blonde hair with reddish highlights in it, stovepipe curls, went all the way down to her waist in the back, Mr. Speaker.

I sat there and talked to her father. I talked to this 4-year-old girl, and she had matching dimples, the cutest thing, right out of Norman Rockwell, and an energy, sparkle in her eye, a smile on her face, the laughter in her voice.

Kids are the source of all joy, by the way.

I remember her trucking around the living room and out to the kitchen and running around and full of energy, but also full of love. And it broke my heart to see that little 4-year-old girl and think about her mother being deployed in a war zone, missing out on 13 months of some of the most joyful time you can have raising a child.

That child was separated from her mother, and that child's mother's name is, today, Senator JONI ERNST, and her daughter is Libby Lou, who is now going to the Military Academy.

But we have people who are separated from their families on a consistent basis. Everybody who is deployed who has children is separated from those children for long periods of time, a lot longer than they are separated from their children when they sneak into America and break our laws.

I honor them. I respect them. I revere them. That has touched my heart for all these years, having seen that, and I have never heard a word of complaint out of either the mother or the daughter or the dad, for that matter, Mr. Speaker.

So I want to remind the body that this separation is not unique to criminal aliens. It is just that it seems that our sympathy is a bit misplaced when we should be thinking about the separation and thankful that they are willing to endure it, the separation that takes place from our Army, our Navy, our airmen, and our marines, and all of those who are serving and protecting our God-given liberty and what that means to our country.

So I think of another time that there was a severe personal problem of a young man who was serving over in the middle of Iraq at Camp Victory. I won't describe that personal problem, Mr. Speaker, but I will just say that it broke my heart to know what was going on also in his personal life.

As I went over to visit him and his unit and present a flag to them that had been flown over the Capitol in his unit's honor, I mentioned to him how difficult it must be. He looked me in the eye with a stoic, patriotic look and he said: It is manageable, sir.

Well, he served his duty and served his time and he served our country nobly and honorably and demonstrated that it was manageable.

This difficulty on the southern border is manageable, too, but we have high principles that we must restore. And the highest principle we must restore is respect for the rule of law.

When Ronald Reagan signed the Amnesty Act in 1986, I watched this debate take place here in the House and in the Senate. And, no, I didn't have C-SPAN then. I watched the text of it and I read the stories on it, and I listened to the newspaper stories as they went on.

And when it passed the House and passed the Senate, the Amnesty Act of 1986 that was supposed to be for a million people, there was supposed to never be another amnesty again so long as this country should live, and they would enforce the law and secure the border at every point since that time. But I didn't believe it, of course, and I was right not to believe it.

When the bill got to President Reagan's desk, President Reagan signed the bill with the advice of most, if not all, of his Cabinet. And most, if not all,

of those who advised him to sign it have regretted that advice because they saw that it was a big mistake. And Ronald Reagan regretted that signature on the 1986 Amnesty Act as well.

But we are here dealing with the problems created by that Amnesty Act because we didn't restore the respect for the rule of law. The right thing to do in 1986 would have been to continue the kind of enforcement that Dwight Eisenhower was utilizing during his terms of office.

Here is some of the data that I happen to have in my pocket, Mr. Speaker.

Dwight Eisenhower mounted a border enforcement program in 1954. In 1954, 1,074,277 illegal aliens were verified to voluntarily return to their home country. 1,074,277 voluntary returns in 1954 alone, that many years ago before the problem was as big as it is today.

Throughout the years of the Eisenhower administration, they managed to deport 250,000 each year, or more. And they managed to do that, Mr. Speaker, with only 800 Border Patrol agents—800 agents. Today, we have 21,000 Border Patrol agents. They had 800.

I divided that out to see what the ratio is.

For every Border Patrol Agent that Dwight Eisenhower had, we have got 26.1 now, and we are deporting—let's see. Last year, 2017, we deported 226,000.

So they got 26 times, more than 26 times better performance, better results, back in the fifties with only 800 Border Patrol agents for 2,000 miles along the southern border, where now it is 21,000. Twenty-six Border Patrol agents for every one they had then, and we are deporting fewer people than they did then.

And by the way, that 1,074,000 voluntary returns, we can set up policy that brings about a lot of that as well.

But ever since Dwight Eisenhower, each President that has succeeded Dwight Eisenhower diminished our enforcement worse and worse and worse and less and less and less. So from Dwight Eisenhower, we ratcheted downhill, and there were fewer that were deported and less border security under Kennedy, under Johnson, under Nixon, and on down the line.

When we got to Bill Clinton, I was very concerned that he was not paying attention to his responsibility to take care that the laws were faithfully executed. When I look back on what he had to say at the time, he was at least giving lip service to it, unlike Hillary Clinton, who essentially came out and said we are going to have to give people citizenship, reward them with citizenship for breaking our laws.

I recall a time here in about 2004 or 2005 when the immigration debate was ramping up again and they had bussed in thousands—many of them illegal aliens, I presume—out here on the west lawn. A lot of them had on matching white T-shirts. I don't remember what they said.

Senator Teddy Kennedy was active then. He went out to speak to them from a sound system and a podium, and he was speaking through an interpreter, a Spanish language interpreter. But I recall the language that he used and how he said it, because it caught me as the clarion call, and it was this.

□ 2115

He said to those thousands, and I believe actually tens of thousands, he said, "Some say report to be deported. I say, report to become an American citizen."

Thirteen or 14 years ago, that message was uttered out here on the west lawn, Mr. Speaker, and that message was calling people into America and promising them citizenship. And this grinds on, the same old story. Erode the rule of law, sacrifice the rule of law, discount and diminish and dilute citizenship, and take away a measure of the influence of citizens and hand it over to people that have demonstrated their contempt for our laws.

But just a little bit before that, I believe it was the year before—I remember the day, it was January 6, 2004—Karl Rove had prepared a speech for George W. Bush and it was an amnesty speech. It was one that played off of Tom Ridge's amnesty speech that he had given the December before. And they decided that they needed to, I will say, advertise to Hispanics in south Texas, because they had lost most of those counties in south Texas that are heavily Hispanic. And, of course, they are heavily Democrat as well.

I remember that discussion with Karl Rove and I said: Karl, you cannot redefine amnesty. The American people know what amnesty is. And whatever you want to say about it, if you want to say it is not amnesty if they pay a fine, it is not amnesty if they learn to speak English, it is not amnesty if they go to school, it is not amnesty if they get a job, what has that got to do with it? To grant amnesty is to pardon immigration lawbreakers, a class of people, pardon them.

And if they say: Well, it is not a pardon if they have to pay a fine. Well, it is a pardon if you don't apply the penalty that exists in the law at the time they violate the law. You can't change the penalty afterwards and claim that it is not amnesty. The American people aren't going to go for that.

At least Ronald Reagan was honest. He said: I am going to sign the amnesty act, and he did. I wish he hadn't, but he did. But you can't redefine it as amnesty is a pardon for immigration lawbreakers. And what is going on here, it is coupled with the reward of the objective of their crime.

When you hand someone the objective of the crime that they committed and you say it is not amnesty—I mean, there are a lot of different ways to describe this, but I think the simplest way is just to say that if someone robs a bank and they step out on the steps of the bank with the loot and you stop

them. Then someone else robs a bank; and someone else robs a bank; and finally, you decide, this is such a popular activity, we can't enforce the law anymore. We would like to have you stop, but since we are going to let you all know we are not going to enforce the law, there are going to be more bank robbers. And, by the way, all of you get to keep the loot.

That is what this amnesty is and the American people know it, and there is outrage that is building. The clouds are not just on the horizon. They are sweeping toward the city. And if we are not going to finish this debate and shoot down that last amnesty bill, then I will tell you that the clouds will be hanging over this city next week on Monday and Tuesday when we come back to town.

The American people are going to be more and more outraged every day because they are just figuring out what is going on. They are being told that these bills aren't amnesty.

I mean, there was a Member down in conference that said the word amnesty and some folks hissed at him because they didn't think you should call it that.

Well, it clearly is amnesty. You can look it up in Black's Law Dictionary. You can take my word for it.

But Members have been going through all kinds of mental gyrations to try to find a way to rationalize the vote that they want to put up because they think that they are politically in a safer place to vote for amnesty, but they know they can't admit it.

I had a Member come to me and he said: "What is the definition of amnesty? I have heard three different definitions in the last hour." And I said: "Well, what is happening there is, they are rationalizing their vote and they are trying to redefine amnesty so they don't have to confess that they are voting for amnesty."

Well, I am not going to have to confess that I voted for amnesty because I am not going to vote for amnesty. But I am going to hold people to a real definition of amnesty.

And by the way, we ought to think about people who have been separated from their families permanently.

How about the angel moms and the angel dads who had a son or daughter that were killed by an illegal alien, especially those that have been turned loose after they have been encountered by law enforcement.

It happens every day in this country, Mr. Speaker, and it happens multiple times a day. This country is dotted with the graves of those who have been killed at the hand of criminal aliens in this country, many of whom had been encountered by law enforcement and turned loose.

One of those I think of is Jamiel Shaw, whom I got to know here as a witness in a hearing that I had called years ago. His son, a high school football star, a stellar athlete with a great future ahead of him, was killed in the

neighborhood just a couple of blocks down the street from Jamiel's home. His son, 17-year-old, Jazz was his nickname, Jazz Shaw, killed by an illegal alien who had been deported.

Part of his gang's mission was he had to kill a Black guy. He was killed because of his race. He was murdered because of gangs. And he was murdered by an illegal alien.

And Jamiel Shaw has the courage these years after to step up every day that need be and tell us how painful it is and what kind of an obscene mistake it is to reward lawbreakers.

If we had enforced immigration laws, Jamiel's son, Jazz, would be alive today and he knows that. And he said over Father's Day, if you are worried about separating families, try spending your Father's Day talking to a grave like he has for the last 10 years.

That shakes me when I read that in text. Another one, Mary Ann Mendoza, her son, Brandon, a fine law enforcement officer, killed by an illegal alien driver. Sabine Durden, her son, her only child, Dominic, killed by an illegal alien, a DACA recipient. Laura Wilkerson, her son, Joshua, was tortured, murdered, and his body burned by an illegal alien.

Who can forget Kate Steinle? Her father, Jim, testified here in this Congress about what happened when she was killed by a five-times deported illegal alien.

And my constituents, my friends to this day, Michelle and Scott Root, who lost their daughter, Sarah Root, who was a perfect 4.0 student in criminal justice at Bellevue College. She had graduated the day before when she was run down on the road by an illegal alien who was on a first-name basis with his immigration attorneys, and who was bailed out of jail for \$5,000. He absconded back to his home country, Honduras.

They said he was bailed out of jail before they could bury their daughter, and for less money than it took to bury their daughter. And what do they have left? They have got memories and broken hearts.

What about the four children who were killed up in Cottonwood, Minnesota, when the school bus was run off the road by an illegal alien who twice had been deported and still ran the school bus off the road. These four kids who were killed were two siblings, and then a child from each of two other families.

And some said: "Accidents happen. It has got nothing to do with immigration." And I say: If we enforce our laws, they are not there to kill our youth. And if you don't agree with me, try going up to those parents and try to convince them that their children would still be dead if we had deported that individual when she was first encountered by the law.

No, we really know. We should know in our hearts and know in our conscience the real truth here, Mr. Speaker. And I think that also a piece of the

real truth is: Who are these DACA recipients?

Barack Obama gave us the standard on what it took to be a DACA recipient. You had to have come in by a certain date or at a certain age, and then he closed that off at the other end. And you needed to be going to school.

So this little chart here tells us a little something. How many of them had no diploma. They might be dropouts—we can't be sure—21.9 percent. There are 817,000 of them in this database. 817,798 we are working with, Mr. Speaker.

And you can see, here are those who have no record at all. They didn't even bother to fill in the blank in their application or their renewal form on whether they had ever gone to school. Maybe they never had—that is the safest presumption—68.9 percent of them, that number is 564,000 disqualified themselves because they are not going to school. They don't attest that they ever went to school.

Even with help filling out the form, that information is not available, and it should have disqualified them. But they got their DACA permit anyway. So there is that 68.9 percent, and 21.9 percent over here that may be dropouts, but we can't be sure. So that is 179,719.

Then, we had self-reported criminals, over 3,000 of them in the first tranche that we were able to look at the numbers; 66 percent of the self-reported criminals received DACA permits. And I guess apparently a number of them committed a lot of crimes after they received their DACA permits, because when they applied for their renewals, then there was a number of well over 30,000, around 33,000, that were self-reported criminals. 94 percent of the self-reported criminals got DACA renewals.

I mean, they are honest criminals at least. They admitted they were criminals, but they were rewarded for being honest, I guess, because two-thirds of those in the beginning of the first tranche of criminals were granted DACA status. And then 94 percent, coming to 31,854 that received their renewals, even though they had committed crimes while they were DACA recipients.

Then we have 8,964 DACA recipients who would be normally, under the rules, under the Obama rules, would be disqualified because of their date of entry. They entered in too early or they entered in too late, 8,964. These are numbers that came from USCIS, by the way. I started asking for them last September and finally received these numbers a little over 2 weeks ago.

2,100 DACA recipients have no data on their nationality. You can't check that box so they should have been disqualified. 775 of them went back to their home country. They put that on their application. That should disqualify them. They can't say, through no fault of their own, that they weren't aware of what they did. If they were aware that they went home, they were

aware that they snuck back in and that they violated the law again.

When I add this all up, and I have to discount that there must be duplicates in these categories, just to be fair, Mr. Speaker, but if we presume that there were no duplicates, that each time that one of these categories that would normally kick them out was an individual, but there might have been people that were criminals that also had no education.

But when I added up the rules violations here that should have disqualified some of them, out of the 817,798 that were approved, there were 789,851 application forms that were deficient and should have brought about a disqualification.

So I just did the math, a little bit more for fun than it is for a definitive number. Only 27,947 of them would qualify even as they attested to their eligibility.

These records are junk. The Obama administration put them in folders on paper, seven pages of application for each applicant, and there are around 2 million of these applications between the originals and the renewals. And of those 2 million, that is 14 million pieces of paper, they just began to electronically enter that data on November 1 of 2015, I believe that date would be.

So we have got a short, little window of these DACA recipients. But here are some other things. How good was the education they got of those who attested they had an education? So we are dealing again with 817,000—almost 818,000. Let's see.

Those who got a GED, 1,789 of them. That is two-tenths of a percent even had a GED. And high school graduates, 37,300. So there are 4.5 percent that are high school graduates. Some college credit, less than a year—so they went to college, 33,000 of those. And let's see, one or more years of college, no degree, 620 of those. So those who started college, 33,000 and change. Those who entered the second year beyond, add another 620.

But those who came with an associate's degree, 235. And these are just raw numbers, not percentages, of course. And those who have a bachelor's degree, college educated: 246 out of 817,000 have a college degree; 14 managed to achieve a master's; professional degrees, 2; doctorates, 1; doctor degree, 1.

□ 2130

So I have heard all this story about valedictorians, and I guess maybe that valedictorian could be that one who received the doctorate degree.

I am a little confused by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), who has all of these highly educated Dreamers down there in his district. They don't show up in these applications unless maybe it is in his district where this single doctor is. These two professionals, I presume maybe they could be lawyers. I met one of those. He told me that he is a DACA lawyer. I said: That is great. Just what we need, another lawless lawyer.

So when I looked through these numbers, they don't at all paint the picture that I am hearing from these Members of Congress among Democrats or Republicans on what a DACA recipient really is and what the typical profile would be of these DACA recipients.

It is true that many of them did, according to the records, come in at a fairly young age. I actually thought that would be higher than it turned out to be. There are around 135,000 of these 817,000 who were brought in at prime gang age recruitment. The oldest one now is about 37 years old. So I presume some of them are grandparents by now.

The rule of law is hanging in the balance. It is our job to keep our oath of office, and that is to preserve, protect, and defend this Constitution of the United States, and that means defend the rule of law. If we allow it to be sacrificed here because our hearts or our politics overrule our heads, then this country will rue the day, and none of us who votes on this issue here will live to see the day that the rule of law is restored again.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CONSERVATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) for 14½ minutes.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, as I begin, I and many others have been outraged by the President's zero-tolerance policy, so it is so therapeutic for me to stand before you today and talk about a program that brings us together rather than divides us. Today I rise to celebrate the successes of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The LWCF is a highly successful conservation program, and it enjoys great bipartisan support. It was created in 1964. It was a bipartisan commitment to safeguard our natural areas, to safeguard our water resources, and to protect and enhance our cultural heritage. We also wanted to be able to provide for recreational opportunities for all Americans.

It was a simple idea. It said: Use the resources from the depletion of one resource, which was offshore oil and gas, to support the conservation of another precious resource, our land and water.

Over its 50-year history, with no cost to taxpayers, it has provided critical access to public lands for hunting, fishing, biking, hiking, climbing, paddling, and many other outdoor activities that Americans enjoy. It has protected critical watersheds, ecosystems that provide for clean, safe drinking water, and has protected the habitat for our wildlife. Finally, it has provided protection and access for cultural and historic sites across our Nation.

Fifty percent of it goes to local and State grants, which help to build and preserve local and State parks, trails, and wildlife areas. Fifty percent in my

State we have used for habitat conservation programs and the Forest Legacy Program. The other 50 percent goes to support access and conservation in and around our U.S. public land.

So, for example, in my district or near my district, really near my district, we have places like the Channel Islands National Park, Joshua Tree National Park, Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, and Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge. They all benefit from the Land and Water.

I would like to say that where we are is that we have a bill now. We finally must deal with the reauthorization, and we have a bill, H.R. 502, that reauthorizes the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and it has the support of 35 Republicans and 194 Democrats. Mr. Speaker, it must be reauthorized before September 30. I ask that you bring it to the floor of the House because it will have overwhelming support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today just to join my colleagues in urging the House to reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund before it expires this September.

I think former Senator "Scoop" Jackson said it best when he introduced the legislation to create this fund nearly a half century ago. He said Americans "go to the open areas." The LWCF is what helps ensure we have open areas in our community where the next generation can gather.

People in my neck of the woods have 600 more open areas to go to in Washington State thanks to the Land and Water Conservation Fund's \$600 million investment in our region. The Land and Water Conservation Fund has helped build parks in places like Tacoma and has helped protect forestland in Kitsap and Mason Counties, without a cost to taxpayers.

Folks come to our region to visit unique places supported by the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and then they stick around to spend some money at our local shops and restaurants. So by investing in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, Congress supports jobs and small businesses. This is good for our economy.

Congress gets a lot for their money when they invest in the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This money helps communities attract private dollars from multiple sources to accomplish big goals. It is the glue that holds these big projects together.

I would like to highlight a couple of the projects that have had a big impact in my neck of the woods.

The South Puget Sound Coastal Forest Legacy Project is a partnership between The Trust for Public Land and Green Diamond Resources Company that will help protect nearly 10,000 acres of working forestlands along the Hood Canal. Keeping this land off-lim-

its to development will help maintain working forest jobs and recreational access to Mason County trails. It will also protect, roughly, 1,400 acres of shellfish beds that serve more than 20 shellfish companies and 2,000 recreational and Tribal harvesters.

The Salt Creek Recreation Area is another great example of what local communities can achieve thanks to support from the LWCF. I grew up just down the road from Salt Creek, so I can tell you firsthand what a difference this park has made for our region. In fact, I took my kiddos there for an amazing day last summer. From the tide pools and sandy beaches to the panoramic views, it is no wonder this park has become a key driver of our growing recreational economy. That project would not have become a reality without the relatively small—just \$250,000—but vital investment from the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

But the LWCF isn't just about creating opportunity in rural communities; it supports recreational opportunities in urban areas as well. Take the Kandle Park and Pool in Tacoma.

Less than a decade ago, this park was just an empty field with a dilapidated playground; but thanks to support from the LWCF, this park hosts a modern aquatics facility and sports fields that provide a safe, fun, and screen-free place for kids to spend their time.

So in my Washington, what I consider the better Washington, we have seen firsthand that the LWCF grows jobs, supports rural economies, and connects our urban communities to the outdoors.

So that is what is on the line. At a time when we are starving for bipartisanship in this place, look no further than H.R. 502. Mr. Speaker, 229 Members, Democrats and Republicans, have cosponsored this. We have 100 days to get it done. I hope that we get this done.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California for yielding.

When I think of California and I think of conservation, I think of John Muir, the father of our national forests and the founder of the Sierra Club. We have a lot to be proud of in California in John Muir. His final resting place was there.

But when I think of conservation, I also think of a wonderful Pennsylvanian conservationist by the name of Gifford Pinchot. Gifford Pinchot was a noted Republican and Progressive conservationist to make Pennsylvania proud. He was the Governor of Pennsylvania twice. He was the first Chief of the United States Forest Service. Above all, he was a pioneer in the American conservation movement. It makes me proud to be from northeastern Pennsylvania where for many, many years Gifford Pinchot lived.